

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 8 July 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Wednesday, 8 July 2025 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair)
Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chair)
Tana Adkin KC
Samapti Bagchi
Deputy John Edwards
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE
Josephine Hayes
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Philip Kelvin
Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Antony Manchester
Timothy James McNally
Sophia Mooney
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Gaby Robertshaw
Naresh Hari Sonpar
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster

Officers:

Baljit Bhandal	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Kieran McCallum	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Planning & Development Director, Environment Department
Alex Thwaites	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Polly Dunn	- Assistant Town Clerk and Executive Director of Governance & Member Services
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

The Town Clerk announced prior to the meeting that Alderwoman Jennette Newman had been formally appointed to the Planning & Transportation Committee and, therefore, had also been appointed to the Planning Applications Sub-Committee at the Court of Common Council meeting held on 22 May 2025.

The Town Clerk also noted that Alderman Alison Gowman, CBE, and Alderman Prem Goyal, OBE, had been left off the front sheet in error, and Gaby Robertshaw's first name had also been left off the front sheet in error. The Town Clerk confirmed that a corrected front sheet had been issued on the City Corporation website.

Apologies were received by Matthew Bell, Alderman Prem Goyal, OBE, Alderman Simon Pryke and Hugh Selka.

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Josephine Hayes stated she would recuse herself from the 55 Fleet Street, EC4Y 1JU application due to ward colleagues having signed a petition in opposition to the development and expressed concern she could be associated with it.

Tana Adkin KC noted she had informed the Committee of her intention to recuse herself from the 55 Fleet Street, EC4Y 1JU application as she had already objected to the application through being a signatory to the aforementioned petition.

Charles Edward Lord indicated that they were a very minor shareholder in Soho House and Company which was, itself, a minor shareholder in Poultry Tenant Limited which had objected to the application. While they felt it was appropriate to abstain, they did not consider it to be a substantial financial interest.

3. **1 OLD JEWRY LONDON EC2R 8DN**

The Committee considered a report for a planning application which sought a change of use of part of the ground floor retail space to be used for office accommodation (Class E(g)), refurbishment works including reconfiguration of commercial floorspace at basement and ground floor levels; alteration to elevations (including new shopfronts, replacement of existing windows and revised access); erection of a new pavilion and plant room at roof level; and creation of an external roof terrace.

Officers introduced the application and noted that the site location was based at Old Jewry, but included frontage onto Poultry and Grocers' Hall Court, and was in the vicinity of Bank London Underground station to the east and Mansion House London Underground station to the west. The proposed development was located within the Bank Conservation Area and was in close proximity to the Guildhall Conservation Area. They added that the building proposed for development itself was not listed, but was in close vicinity to other listed buildings which included: the Grade I-listed 27-35 Poultry building which was

The Ned Hotel to the east, the Grade II*-listed 1 Poultry building to the south, and the Grade II-listed buildings at Fredericks Place and 35 Old Jewry to the west. The immediate surroundings included mainly commercial buildings in use which operated as offices, but some operated as hotels as well. The Officers noted there were some residential properties, but they were further afield at Grocers' Hall, Fredericks Place and Mansion House.

Officers presented a view of the existing development site from Poultry at the ground-floor level and stated that the structure was a contemporary Portland stone building, rectangular in design and had a somewhat fragmented ground floor appearance.

Officers presented an image of the proposed development from the east elevation and stated that the proposal consisted of ground floor façade alterations which included replacements to the windows and a rooftop extension. They added that the property was maintain in office use currently but was largely vacant and the proposal sought to reify the office space at a much higher standard in order to bring the asset back into commercial use. Officers added that the east elevation view was from the Ned Hotel, Grocers' Hall side.

An image of the south elevation of the proposed development from Poultry was presented to the Committee. Officers stated it showed at ground floor the proposed amended retail frontage and the proposed removals of the louvers over the existing windows on the third floor and above, and the proposed roof extension and terrace.

The west elevation of the proposed development from Old Jewry and Fredericks Place was also presented to Members by Officers.

Officers presented the ground floor plan to the Sub-Committee and noted that one could see the enhanced office lobby with access onto Old Jewry. Officers noted that the proposed lobby would result in the loss of retail in the principal shopping centre (PSC). However, that had been balanced against the enhanced retail frontage proposed and, as per the office report, it was considered acceptable. Officers added that the proposal included a dedicated new cycle entrance and remaining areas, such as the loading bay and substation, would all remain as is.

An image of the ninth-floor plan on the rooftop was presented by officers to Members. The officers stated that the proposal sought to provide one additional floor of office amenity with a plant enclosure above and the pavilion had been designed to be set within the rooftop as a subservient addition. The proposed impact on the surrounding heritage assets had also been deemed acceptable as per the Officers report. Officers added that the terrace had also been assessed against suicide prevention advice and was considered acceptable following consultation with specialist officers. They informed Members that a condition had been proposed to secure further details if the proposed was approved and suicide prevention measures would be reviewed further by specialist officers.

The proposed tenth floor plan (pavilion roof) was also presented by Officers to the Sub-Committee. Officers noted it was above the office amenity level and the associated green roof would come with the floor.

Officers informed the Sub-Committee that several objections had been received, with the majority being related specifically to the impact on the neighbouring The Ned hotel, specifically the rooftop Members Club. While the objections had been considered in the officer report, they indicated that the applicant had taken concerns raised into account through the submission of amended plans, such as the inclusion of a daylight and sunlight assessment, and an amended rooftop layout. Officers presented the proposed alterations at roof level to Members and stated that the amendments related to the removal of the terrace access door from the eastern side of the pavilion which faced The Ned hotel and the provision of landscaping to reduce any perceived overlooking.

An illustration of the proposed privacy screening facing eastward toward The Ned was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers. Officers stated that they considered the relationship between the buildings to be acceptable and akin to other commercial relationships within the City. Furthermore, Officers added that while the neighbours had questioned the outcome of the submitted daylight assessment, officers considered the submission to provide a robust assessment. In relation to objections specifically regarding a loss of view, officers noted that while it was not the function of the planning system to protect private view, the case affirmed that views could still be relevant in planning, especially if it was a specific public interest to protect that view. In this case, officers further stated that they did not believe there was a specific public interest to protect the view given the commercial and private nature of the property, and the view to the wider inner-city area.

Officers concluded, overall, that they were satisfied with the proposed development in relation to neighbouring properties and the development was considered to have complied with the development plan when taken as a whole and was recommended for approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the officer report.

The Chair asked the Objectors to address the Sub-Committee and invited Mr. Dan Zaum to speak to the meeting.

Mr. Zaum addressed the Sub-Committee and confirmed he was the landlord of The Ned hotel at 27 Poultry. He informed the Sub-Committee that the building was a Grade I-listed building designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens who he stated was a figure synonymous with British architectural excellence and noted that The Ned building was listed with Guildhall and the Royal Exchange as a prominent building in the City. Mr. Zaum told the Sub-Committee that the building was acquired more than 15 years ago and had been restored with considerable care and investment, with the end result being The Ned hotel, a celebrated project which helped redefined the City of London, brought visitors at the weekends and attracted leisure and business visitors alike, as well as top tier retailers. He also added that it turned Bank Junction into a recognised destination for global

hospitality. Mr. Zaum stated that story was now at risk as the proposal before the Sub-Committee would introduce a large rooftop extension at 1 Old Jewry which directly compromised the visual setting and privacy of The Ned, and added that he believed the applicant wished to building a pavilion that a future tenant would use to entertain parties a couple of times a month and would compromise activities at The Ned which took place on a daily and weekly basis throughout the day. Mr. Zaum suggested that the developer did not carry out consultation despite The Ned's role as landlord and the building's clear proximity to the development, and added they would have been easy to locate given the developer's planning consultant was the landlord's property managers. Mr. Zaum told Members that the amendments made since a successful judicial review were minor and failed to address the business' legitimate concerns, especially as heritage experts had found the developer's assessment to be flawed as it dismissed the impact on the roof terrace and ignored the significance of the setting and architecture. He added that the officer presentation, in his view, did not show the actual impact and comparisons of previous nearby roof additions were inaccurate as none were as prominent or intrusive. Mr Zaum informed the Sub-Committee that, in 2009, The Ned was advised by the City that a similar extension on the hotel building would not be supported and indicated he was happy to share the minutes of the 21st December 2009 meeting with Members. He further noted that the guidance received at that meeting had shaped The Ned's approach and investment, and it was difficult to reconcile the precedent set at the December 2009 meeting with current support for the application and queried what had changed since then. Mr. Zaum concluded by urging the Sub-Committee to reject the application, specifically in relation to the pavilion.

The Chair invited another Objector, Mr. Stuart Colin Adolph, to address the Sub-Committee and speak to the meeting.

Mr. Adolph addressed the Sub-Committee and indicated he represented the operator and tenant of the Ned Hotel and was the development director that led the conversion of the former Midland Bank headquarters between 2013 and 2017. Mr. Adolph stated that the work carried out on that project had altered, extended and restored the building, having worked alongside the City of London planning and design officers who ultimately awarded Mr. Adolph and his team with a heritage award for its conservation which included the creation of the rooftop experience. He added that officers at the time appreciated the importance of connecting views to listed buildings in the City and The Ned rooftop was a popular destination for its members, hotel guests, and thousands of visitors to The Ned who frequented the rooftop each year to enjoy the setting and the historic city environment. Mr. Adolph noted he was made aware of the first planning application at Old Jury when the consent was granted in the first instance, and was asked to examine the impact, in the absence of any consultation from the applicants, by the hotel's managing director. He informed Members he approached the applicant's agenda to find out why they had not consulted The Ned as a neighbourly courtesy and was told that it was a not a major application and that consultation was not necessary. He added that he believed this was against the City of London's guidance and the applicant had ignored the advice given by officers during pre-application meetings. Mr.

Adolph indicated that other options had been suggested to the applicant to allow the extension of their building that would not be as detrimental to the setting of the Grade I-listed Ned and Grade II*-listed 1 Poultry opposite the road, and suggested that the applicant had done nothing to attempt to preserve the setting of the listed building nor to mitigate against the harm perceived by the objectors being done to the heritage assets. Mr. Adolph further told the meeting that he had engaged in further meetings to be told that the large and poorly designed massing on the rooftop was necessary to meet energy and environmental performance targets, as well as to provide amenity space for the applicant's office tenants which would be used relatively infrequently when compared to activity on The Ned roof. He informed Members that he had offered to work with the applicant to explore potential solutions and had identified a number of more sensitive design issues that could be addressed further to limit the impact on the heritage buildings of The Ned and 1 Poultry. The Ned had expressed a preference for extensions lower down the applicant's building and were prepared to concede rights of light in order to preserve of amenity of The Ned and the historic views around the City, and to maintain its connection to St. Paul's Cathedral and other historic landmarks in the City of London. Mr. Adolph stated that the diminution of the settings of The Ned and 1 Poultry were not able to be assessed by Historic England as their lack of resource meant they deferred to City of London design officers who had not made adequate assessment of the relationship and the importance of the listed buildings and conservations areas in which the buildings were situation. He confirmed that The Ned had commissioned its own heritage report, which officers had not presented to the Sub-Committee, that presented the harm perceived to be done to the The Ned building and 1 Poultry across the road, as well as the impact on the Conservation Area. He also added that the quality of the architecture and selection of materials for the extension was of poor quality and the choice was not at all complimentary to the existing building. Mr. Adolph outlined that there was no question that if the current application was approved, The Ned rooftop would become a less desirable place for members, guest and hotel visitors, and while it was hard to quantify the financial impact on The Ned's business, there was a risk it was a significant sum which would undermine The Ned's ability to continue to conserve the important Grade I-listed building. Mr. Adolph concluded that to allow the extension of 1 Old Jewry in the manner presented to the Sub-Committee would not only undermine the decisions of the Sub-Committee in the past, but would also open the door for others who had watched the application closely to further undermine and potentially destroy the setting of heritage assets in the City which had, up to now, been conserved stoically and urged the Sub-Committee to refuse the application and invite the applicant to reconsider their design to avoid the detrimental impact that the extension would bring, and to consult appropriately with neighbours to find a balanced scheme that brought benefits that could outweigh the harm.

The Chair invited Members to ask questions of the Objectors.

A Member queried what The Ned's business model was and expressed interest as to how many members The Ned would stand to lose if the rooftop pool was overlooked and could not be used. Mr. Adolph responded that it was difficult to

quantify, The Ned currently had around 3,500 members and a lot of current users enjoyed the pool. He noted there was also a social membership, a leisure membership, and a wellness membership – those who had a social membership would use the rooftop enormously during the Summer months and throughout the year. He added that the rooftop had been carefully designed to be used all year round which City of London officers in 2015 had agreed was good for the business and The Ned was one of the first in the City to bring the rooftop to the level it was at to capture the immersive view of the City landscape in and around the building, and the connection to St. Paul's Cathedral from the rooftop was a highly significant draw. He suggested that the installation of the two-storey extension at 1 Old Jewry would remove the connection between The Ned and listed assets and concluded that The Ned would almost certainly lose Members as the view from the rooftop often sealed membership deals. Mr. Zaum added that rooftop access also included hotel guests, as well as the 3,500 members.

Another Member expressed concern of the impact on the Grade I-listed building and outlined there were three issues in her view: the height of the proposed pavilion, the surfacing in wood and glass with the green screen, and the overlooking aspect and impact on the view. The Member queried that if the pavilion was shorter, or the facing was completed with a material that matched the contemporary Portland stone, whether the applicants objections be less forthright, or whether a combination of the three issues was a step too far. Mr. Adolph responded that they had reached out to the owners of 1 Old Jewry to suggest they could remove the storey extension so that existing rooftop was no higher than The Ned rooftop was currently. He also indicated that they had suggested potentially looking at alternative ways to replan their plant so it sat in lower parts of the building, and had suggested there were shoulders on the building that could be extended to mitigate some of the floor space the applicant could lose by extending the building in the manner they had chosen to do. Mr. Adolph noted that the applicant had compromised on the reorientation of the windows and some of the access routes. However, that did not help with the amenity that was lost on the roof of The Ned as the materials on 1 Old Jewry were damaging and would contrast significantly and detract from the surroundings. He added it would also lead to little to no light reflection which was an issue given the rooftop was designed to ensure those who used it absorbed natural daylight.

It was noted by a Member that Objectors had made some suggestions to the owners of 1 Old Jewry and queried how far the Objectors had gotten to being able to share a design that ensured both buildings could have rooftop space that complimented one another, was immersive and added to the skyline of the City. Mr. Adolph confirmed a small workshop was done of the roof of The Ned overlooking the roof of 1 Old Jewry and had suggested that the existing roof level could be used as a deck, and the extensions could have been taken down into lower parts of the building, but that was detrimental to the amount of floor space the owner wanted to create. Therefore, Mr. Adolph suggested, the discussions had were dismissed by the applicant's architect and the applicant themselves.

The Member sought to confirm that the proposal was for the rooftop to be used by office workers and users of the building as an extra facility to enjoy the cityscape, and not to be a permanent event space. Mr. Adolph confirmed Objectors were not denying the use of the rooftop and actively encouraged it as The Ned has its own rooftop and noted it was a clever way for developers to exploit outside space on their buildings, particularly in confined, built-up, areas like the City of London. He added that while they were not opposed to the rooftop being in use, they were opposed to the bulk and mass of the extensions proposed and the ruining of the amenity in place at The Ned. He further noted there was no reason why a staircase could not be created from the lower floor of the office building onto the roof deck and a more appropriately sized extension for plant enclosures be created to the rear of the building.

A Member of the Sub-Committee sought to understand what Objectors had done to engage with the developer and the applicant, and queried what was included in the heritage pack that had been prepared which had not been included in the papers for the meeting. Mr. Adolph confirmed that the heritage study was carried out by Miriam Volic, a heritage consultant, who assessed the setting of the Grade I-listed Ned building, the Bank Conservation Area, as well as 1 Poultry on the opposite side of the road. He told Members that the outcome of Ms. Volic's report stated that the extensions would not be as subservient as the building was currently and the extensions on 1 Old Jewry could possibly begin to dominate the rooftop of The Ned next door. The extensions could also imposed on the viewpoint from 1 Poultry next door. Mr. Adolph stated that while he did not have the report with him, it had been shared with officers and was submitted as an objection letter and in the public domain. Mr. Adolph also suggested that Ms. Volic was concerned with the lack of amenity space and other detrimental impacts on the building such as the loss of retail space, and it was perceived that the harm being done by the rooftop extension to the Grade I and Grade II*-listed buildings adjacent to it did not outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Mr. Adolph also confirmed that the initial consent was taken to a judicial review and, at that point, had engaged with Savills project management team, as well as the planning team, and invited them to a meeting at The Ned. He added that the meeting was on the rooftop of The Ned and queried why the applicants had not consulted with the owners of The Ned, of which they were told that was not to be seen as a major application and consultation was not necessary. Mr. Adolph noted that was in contravention of City guidance and guidance given the applicant by planning officers in pre-application meetings, so The Ned knew nothing of the application initially and the signage installed was not done so in the prominent way to indicate that a planning application had been lodged. Mr Adolph further added that subsequent meetings were carried out following that in which the applicant had tried to respond to some of the concerns that had been raised which included changes to the orientation of the windows, a change to the walked, and the addition of some landscaping and planting to screen their building from The Ned building. However, Mr. Adolph suggested they were intransigent in wanting to reduce the bulk and extra volume that was added to the proposed building and was made clear in the third and final meeting with Deka Group. Mr Adolph indicated he was disappointed not to have been able to influence the design more than had been desired.

The Chair noted that the referred to Objectors report had been part of the background papers.

A Member questioned whether the bulk of the objections raised by the Objectors specifically related to setting privacy and bulk of the proposals as opposed to noise as noise had been factored heavily in the papers and considered whether an analysis of additional noise had been done as he considered Bank Junction to be a noisy area, especially when roof terraces were in use. Mr. Adolph confirmed that the principal objection as specifically around the bulk and mass of the extension and the injury to the listed building and setting of the listed buildings. However, the City, as did other local authorities, had stringent rules on noise control and it was a concern, particularly with regards to the plant. Therefore, it needed to be made sure that background noise checks were done in an adequate way, reported appropriately against the plant and equipment being installed on the roof and, if the Sub-Committee was minded to approve the application, Objectors would have to be very careful in ensuring the submissions came in and ensure that the right representations were made to mitigate the noise. However, Mr. Adolph indicated Objectors were not too concerned about noise from the use of the space as the applicant's use of the space was likely to be less used and in reduced hours compared to The Ned and did not see the amenity of the rooftop being damaging in relation to noise, but just wanted to ensure the plant enclosures were fit for purpose.

The Chair invited the Applicants to address the Sub-Committee and speak to the meeting.

Mr. Price, a senior director at Savills, who was the planning agent who acted on behalf of the applicant, Deka Group, addressed the Sub-Committee and noted that Deka Group was one of the largest providers of property funds in Germany and currently managed assets worth around €50bn, with its UK portfolio currently comprised of 30 assets valuing in excess of £5.5bn, with 86% invested in Central London and currently held nine core assets in the City of London which included eight office buildings, one hotel and the office portfolio was occupied by some of the world's leading companies which included BNP Paribas, Skanska and CMS. 1 Old Jewry was held in Deka's largest fund, Deka Europa, which was represented at the meeting by Marcus Vinkler. He added that the application before the Sub-Committee was Deka's first full building refurbishment in the City of London and formed part of a wider programme of planned investment to ensure its portfolio continued to provide best-in-class accommodation. The proposal sought to refurbish, reconfigure and optimise the building at the site. Mr. Price noted that the floor space had become vacant last year following the relocation of the former tenant Fidessa Group and Deka had proposed a suite of works to bring the floor space back up to date in relation to the quality of the accommodation, amenity provision, sustainable travel and energy efficiency. The proposal also included a small-scale extension at the roof level to create a pavilion and roof terrace, and the enhanced retail floor space at the ground floor. Mr. Price told Members that the strategic focus of the adopted and draft local plans was to retain and enhance the role of the City as

a global office and finance location and noted a requirement by the City for the provision of a minimum of 1.2mft² of net additional space by 2040, and there was an increasingly important requirement to ensure all development was sustainable, with emerging Policy S4 having supported retrofit that upgraded environmental performance. He further stated that the quality of the proposed development would facilitate private sector investment into an existing vacant building to deliver additional and enhanced office floor space and was exactly the type of development envisaged and supported by the plan. The design and operation of the future development also accorded with all detailed planning policies and carefully balanced the requirement to manage impacts while having sought to maximise the opportunities of the site. Mr. Price informed Members that the proposal was developed initially through a comprehensive analysis of the local context, with regard to heritage assets and local views, with input from professional officers at the pre-application and application stage, and the comprehensive analysis of the extension and rooftop level in the officer's report concluded that the additional mass had been sensitively designed and positioned such that it was not visible from any of the local viewpoints. Where it was visible, such as from elevated viewpoints or terraces, officers found that the mass blended into the varied utilitarian roofscape and have a neutral impact. Mr. Price additionally stated that any impact from the additional massing had been further mitigated through the use of high quality materials and had been chosen so the addition was clearly distinct from the original building, yet complementary both to the host and the varied roofscape in the locality. Other physical works to the building would deliver dual benefits of visual and operational enhancements, and the work to the shop front would remove the narrow deep bays to be replaced with wider glazed openings as seen on the images presented by officers. Mr. Price suggested that the original design had significantly impacted the success of the retail floor space and the small loss of retail floor space at ground floor was considered to be far outweighed by the improved shopfront and operational benefits. The alterations to the principal elevations to change windows and removal of the *brise soleil* would create a simplified and more open elevation and would enhance views into and out of the building, and provide an opportunity for the installation of openable windows and natural ventilation in the future. He further added that there were material enhancements to accessibility which included an enhanced office entrance which would include a barrel door suitable for all visitors, as well as a dedicated access for cyclists, along with a significant increase of on-site parking and changing and showering facilities. Mr. Price told Members the proposal would deliver a material improvement to the sustainability credentials of the building, with targeted ratings of BREEAM 'Outstanding' and NABERS five-star and noted that there had been a number of third-party objections from The Ned hotel. However, according to Mr. Price, the applicant had engaged closely with the operator given the sensitivities raised with regard to private member use and, despite officer satisfaction with the proposal, the applicant had agreed to make amendments to the layout and design of the terrace to restrict any potential overlooking, and the access point had been relocated to the opposite side of the building and would only be used as a fire escape route. Mr. Price concluded that, while not a policy requirement, the applicant had also assessed the impact of light afforded to hotel terraces and rooms and there

was no impact to the terraces and very limited levels of impact to any of the hotel rooms.

The Chair invited Members of the Sub-Committee to ask questions of the Supporters.

The Deputy Chair sought clarification on the level of engagement undertaken by the applicant given the City had issued developer engagement guidance which was shared with all developers, especially as comments had been made that very little engagement had been had. Mr. Price indicated multiple phone calls and conversations had been had with neighbours at The Ned, including three formal meetings and had been through the development in some detail and, as had been suggested, alternatives were presented which were considered but, unfortunately, the alternatives were not commercially viable and were weighted toward the aspiration of The Ned hotel. Mr. Price stated that to suggest the applicants had not engaged or listened was unfair as they had met multiple times with neighbours on their property and elsewhere, and there had been a significant attempt to work with them. He added Deka, as the applicant, understood that it had to be a neighbourly partner and wanted to protect private member use as best as possible whilst not losing an opportunity for the site.

A Member asked the Supporter to expand upon the proposal's sustainability credentials and queried whether air source heat pumps were being installed. Mr. Price confirmed there were improvement works planned to examine all aspects of operational energy efficiency which included a replacement plant and air source heat pumps.

The Member followed up and queried whether the heat pump replacement involved any space on the roof. Mr. Price confirmed that it would be in the enclosure of the plant screen.

Another Member queried what the capacity of the terrace and the height of the balustrades were on the seventh floor. Mr. Price responded that he did not believe there was a fixed occupational maximum number on the terrace, but he believed it was planned to be approximately 150 persons. In relation to the balustrades, Mr. Price stated they were set at 1.4m for the roof terraces and noted there was a condition tied to planned works which led to the establishment of a protection process, including CCTV and the design of the terrace, specifically in relation to where furniture would be placed.

The Member questioned why the hours were set from 8:00am until 11:00pm given it was an office building. Mr. Price noted that it was not intended to be an event space that went beyond the use of office hours and indicated that if there was a feeling from Members was inappropriate for the location, he had no doubt the applicant would reconsider the opening times.

A Member drew attention to a report which was prepared in opposition on behalf of the tenant and freeholder by MVHC which suggested that the proposal failed to preserve or enhance the character of the relevant heritage

assets and their settings and, therefore, contravened the requirements of the NPPF, and queried whether the Objector was correct and whether the alternative proposals could be outlined that were considered for the rooftop space. Mr. Price responded that there was a heritage assessment by Montagu Evans was provided as part of the application which produced a very different conclusion to the one produced by MVHC. With regard to the alternative options presented by The Ned hotel, Mr. Price noted they included staircase to the roof terrace which was not accessible or appropriate and if there was going to be a roof terrace, more massing was required which was why he believed the proposals were not commercially realistic. Mr. Price further added that, in relation to the height and whether one felt it should be a different level of ambition, there was a condition related to materiality and, if it was felt that a lighter finish stone or a cladded finish was more appropriate, it could be dealt with through the application of the condition.

A question was raised by a Member as to why the proposal sought to reduce the retail space by 30% and turn three units into one unit given the importance of Cheapside as one of four PSCs of the City was recognised by the Supporter. Mr. Price responded that all the retail floor space was vacant when the previous office tenant left the building and one saw from the images that it was a harsh and dense retail frontage which had slit windows and an oblique view which had made it difficult for one to retail out of the floor space. Therefore, what had been proposed was a suite of works at ground floor to enhance the functionality of the retail floor space so there was a reduction of approximately 150m² of floor space. He added, however, that in relation to reactivating and bringing the floor space back into use, the proposal had much greater benefits and would be to the betterment of Cheapside PSC than the floor space as it existed.

It was considered by a Member whether thought had been given to The Ned when the proposal was being designed. Mr. Price explained in response that the first phase was a full assessment of the local context, and was not explicitly concentrated on The Ned, but other heritage assets such as 1 Poultry, Grocers Hall Court and Fredericks Place. He added that time had also been spent with officers walking the area and the proposal had been designed to be cognisant of the vantage points.

The Member noted that The Ned was a Grade One-listed building and queried whether the applicants had visited the rooftop of the building to understand the skyline. Mr. Price stated there was a full understanding around the vantage points, as well as the localised views, and a full assessment had been undertaken of all the viewpoints. He added he agreed with the assessment that some buildings had greater status and weighting, but the assessment had started by looking at everything to develop a scheme which was most appropriate for the site and then looked at the sensitivities of the listed buildings.

The Member also queried whether the terrace was for people to move up to the roof to use it and whether it was to be used as an event space. Mr. Price stated that the pavilion space was the arrival space at the top of the building to access the roof terrace, but there was no formal cover for that terrace and was not

intended to be an event space or something that went materially beyond its amenity space associated with the office function.

The Member questioned whether an alternative could be installed at the rooftop that would potentially have been better for the skyline. Mr. Price stated there was a requirement to have plant equipment on the rooftop, a requirement for access for all, including lift access, and there was a requirement to have a form of arrival space which was part of what had driven the operational changes to the building which helped to deliver wider benefits in relation to sustainability and enhanced access. He added, therefore, that the space created on the rooftop was part of the overall proposal and was critical to how the project was delivered.

Concern was expressed by a Member about the applicant's relationship with their neighbours as it seemed like the potential for nuisance could potentially be created and sought to understand whether it was offices or something different that was being offered. Mr. Price responded that it was office space, and the amenity function was associated with the office building and would only be used by employees or visitors to the offices. Mr. Price also added that, in relation to the relationship to neighbours, the applicant had looked at reduced overlooking by changing the window design and the access points. Green screening had also been proposed to minimise overlooking and the layout of the terrace had been changed so there was no dwelling space directly adjacent to the Ned. Mr. Price noted that The Ned themselves had said they were not necessarily concerned about the use of the floor or the floor space as a terrace and, therefore, did not believe there was any risk of the use of the roof terrace becoming a nuisance.

A Member sought clarity on whether the roof terrace was attached to a particular office floor or was to be utilised by the whole building, and queried whether the pavilion would have any toilets in the area if it was an arrival space. Mr. Price confirmed that the space would be available to all tenants on all floors, regardless of whether a single occupier took the whole building or not, and while the pavilion space was an access point, it would have set down areas and toilets to enable to service both the pavilion space and the roof terrace.

The Chair invited Members of the Sub-Committee to ask questions of officers in attendance.

A Member asked whether the green screening proposed was part of a condition. Officers confirmed that there was a landscaping condition which also covered the long-term maintenance.

The Deputy Chair drew attention to comments by the Objector in relation to a lack of signage visible at street level and sought confirmation that the statutory consultation process had been undertaken as the Objector had indicated they had received no notification from the City about the planning application. The Deputy Chair also sought to understand how much weight was to be given in planning terms to a private terrace's right to a view. Officers responded that there was a substantive table illustrating the consultation process for the

application in the report which had included re-consultations, various site notices, city notices and letters to neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, Officers felt that the consultation process had been completed successfully. In relation to the loss of view for the neighbouring property, Officers explained that while there was no private right to a view over another property, it did not necessarily mean that it was completely irrelevant in planning terms. However, it was up to the local authority to decide how much weight to give the view and whether there was a public interest in the protection of the view that the current occupier enjoyed. They added that as there was a urban context in relation to that view and, while limited weight had been given to the view in the office report, it was not considered that protecting the view was in the public interest.

A Member drew attention to a previous comment made by an Objector that they had been told in 2009 by the City that a similar extension on The Ned was not permitted and queried what had changed since 2009. Officers explained that there were negotiations about alterations to the Grade One-listed building and suggested the advice may have been at the time that the roof extension of the Grade One-listed building was not acceptable. However, Officers had not had sight of the correspondence related to that case. Officers added that Members were asked to consider the merits of the proposal's design, and the officer report had been clear that they did not see heritage harm related to the impact of the development and that the design itself was considered acceptable.

A question was raised on the screening by a Member as to whether it was hard or green screening. The Member also queried whether a greater use of roof terraces would be encouraged given the proposal. Officers explained that if there was any damage to the planting, it would be replanted. In relation to the roof terraces, Officers explained that policy DM10.3 encouraged the use of roof terraces. They added that the existing rooftop had been considered by design officers to be an appropriate addition to the existing building and, on that basis, had been assessed as acceptable in policy terms.

A Member expressed concern about the 11:00pm end to the operating hours of the building, especially in relation to the suicide prevention SDP and while there was CCTV, there was nothing to actually prevent a suicide other than a higher balustrade, and it being used as an office space made no difference. She further added that she wished to see the balustrade raised and suggested not to leave it as a condition on its own. Officers responded that the application had been assessed against the preventing suicide advice note and had been considered acceptable as the balustrade was 1.4m when building regulations had set it as 1.1m. Officers added it had also been stepped back from the edge of the building and there were existing terraces below the building which would deter incidents. Officers confirmed that it had been assessed as part of the application that the condition sought to request further details on how the best management scheme could be secured in perpetuity.

Another Member sought to understand the process for how the material of the massing could be changed after an acceptance of the proposal before the Sub-Committee. Officers confirmed that condition samples would be submitted and would be considered ordinarily under the Scheme of Delegations.

It was raised by a Member whether officers would consider conditioning the use of obscured glass on the side of the pavilion facing The Ned from floor to ceiling or a solid side to the pavilion. Officers responded that in consideration of the overlooking impacts, they had to bear in mind that there were two commercial elements looking one another and how much weight they were given. However, while the hotel was given weight as people were expected to be there, it was also a transient use and the office use was also certain times of the day, and was a relationship that was common in the city. They added that there were multiple hotels within close proximity to office space and had assessed the proposal on the basis of it being acceptable because of the precedent and the commercial relationship. Officers further noted that what Savills and the applicant had proposed as amendments were not specifically requested by officers, but put forward following objections submitted by third parties, and now it had been put forward, officers confirmed they would look to secure the amendments within conditions. Officers suggested, therefore, that it was something examined within the officer report and had considered the relationship to be acceptable. Officers also cautioned against trying to design a scheme, especially as they were content with the green screen proposed by the applicant as it added to urban greening and a number of benefits outlined in the report, and roof terraces were a big dynamic of attracting occupiers to the City and suggested it would be difficult to let out buildings without external terraces. They concluded that it was typical to have external terraces close to other external terraces within commercial uses.

The Chair moved the meeting to a debate of the Members.

The Deputy Chair stated that there was a risk of losing perspective as there was an issue in the Square Mile with the provision of Grade B office stock being put to good use and a vacancy rate that was about 10% across Grade B office stock. He added that the proposal was a deep retrofit which retained 95% of the carbon for a 10% uplift in office space which was a relatively small addition of 100 extra employees, with the building only being able to locate 600 employees. The Deputy Chair also expressed concerns that a private hotel terrace with a membership of 3,500 was being discussed in relation to an office block of 600 employees when one considered how many could fit onto the roof terrace at one time that would cause a disturbance which he did not believe made sense. He added that the Sub-Committee needed to be mindful that the delivery of a NABERS five-star office building with a BREEAM rating of 'outstanding' delivered on the City's Sustainability SPD and that needed to be considered more than design features. The Deputy Chair confirmed he supported the scheme as it stood.

Another Member stated that the existence of a private pool on a roof preventing adjacent buildings from not having terraces was not a good precedent to set and added it was normal to have pools being overlooked by buildings in hot countries such as Singapore or Thailand. The Member also suggested it was odd that Historic England had not responded to the application if they were concerned given they did usually respond. He also told the Sub-Committee that the installation of air-sourced heat pumps and replacement of gas boilers was

important and required rooftop space. He added, in relation to green screening, that the Sub-Committee should encourage applicants to plant on roofs and felt the scheme was positive.

It was stated by a Member, who noted she had attended a site visit, that the roof as it currently stood was a sad site at present and fully supported the idea of bringing it into use, but expressed concern about the two storey upward extension, the look of it and the effect it had on the Grade One-listed building next door and it was something that the Sub-Committee ought to be concerned about and did not understand why a more sustainably friendly scheme had not been proposed. The Member added that there was another rooftop garden just below the proposed rooftop terrace and regretted that the proposal had not been for another rooftop garden rather than the upward building of two storeys. The Member further stated that, while she welcomed the installation of air sourced heat pumps, she was not satisfied that there had been sufficient consideration of how that could be accommodated on the roof at the top or on a lower roof and did not feel it was good enough at the moment.

Another Member indicated that focus on the rooftop terrace had occurred as that was where the objection had been directed and noted the obligation the Sub-Committee had to consider the impact on a Grade One-listed building that would be there long into the future. She stated that granting permission for a structure that could be perceived as a shed on top of a building that changed the city skyline was setting a precedent and was what planning did. The Member also considered the precedent when other buildings sought planning permission for two more levels and suggested that if the wellbeing of office workers was being considered in relation to a terrace, two extra floors on top, in her view, were not needed and confirmed she would not support the application.

The Chair reminded the Sub-Committee that a decision on the application was to be taken today on its own merits and was not to consider how it would affect future schemes.

A Member stated that Members had to remember that Historic England had left the decision up to the Sub-Committee as was often the case with smaller schemes and suggested that the fact Historic England had not commented was irrelevant. The Member also added that if the City, through encouraging Destination City, and expecting hotels and other uses to come in and supplement City businesses, then the Sub-Committee had to take account of what was happening at roof level. He told the rest of the Sub-Committee that it seemed to be a bulky two storey extension that was not just a terrace as it had an actual built structure and the roofscape on top with the plant would have an adverse impact and would likely also adversely affect the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings. He concluded that he did not believe the design met the high standards that the location expected and did not feel the proposal was good enough.

Another Member indicated he was a supporter of retrofitting but expressed concern as to whether the rooftop terrace was fit for purpose in its current plan

as it was not sympathetic to the surroundings and did not feel due consideration had been given to the design. The Member added that he acknowledged it was not the Sub-Committee's role to design, but he suggested more thought should have been given to the sympathetic nature of neighbouring buildings, including The Ned, and cautioned, when talking about Destination City, disregarding a functioning hotel that had an attractive style and the around 3,500 members at The Ned. He also stated he was concerned at the lack of engagement and neighbourliness from the developers and a lack of due consideration for potential alternatives, especially as there had been no explanation as to why other potential alternatives were not commercially viable. The Member advised the applicant to defer the application to work on a more sympathetic alternative or he, otherwise, would be unable to support the application as it stood.

The Sub-Committee was addressed by a Member who informed that she walked past the existing structure every day and believed it had become an eyesore but initially was well utilised when the structure first opened with retail units before the company went out of business. She stated that the structure desperately needed a refurbishment, and a retrofit was the best way to achieve that. However, she expressed concerns on the operating hours of the roof terrace as it could encourage a greater use which would have a greater impact on The Ned and 1 Poultry, and indicated she did not support the 1.4m balustrades on a 9 storey building as the only way to stop someone potentially going the edge was to high a rail high enough to completely deter. She also added she did not believe a fall from two floors from ninth to a seventh floor balcony would be enough of a deterrent and wanted to ensure that the City took its responsibility seriously in designing out suicide. The Member also suggested she was equally concerned for hotel guests at The Ned with regard to noise, and agreed with previous points made that Historic England had entrusted the decision to the City. She concluded that she believe the main issue was the rooftop area and, with the imagination of an architect working alongside neighbours of 1 Old Jewry and with planning officers, a design could be created that was fit for purpose, would be safe and not have a detrimental impact on neighbours. The Member, therefore, indicated she would vote against the granting of the planning application if the application was not deferred.

Regret was expressed by a Member that, 20 years after the building had been agreed by a previous planning committee, it was no longer viable and expressed concern that other such proposals to retrofit would not come along if the proposal was not agreed as the same issues were likely to be raised regardless of who came along. The Member indicated he did not believe there was any heritage harm and urged the Sub-Committee to focus back on the building itself and whether it gave viability to the City. The Member suggested he would support the approval of the planning application.

Another Member stated that the Sub-Committee's role was not to question the design of applications submitted, but to make sure the process had been adhered to in the granting of planning permission and indicated he was satisfied that it had been. He added that he agreed with the principle raised that a situation could not arise whereby a user of the building had decided to utilise

their roof in a particular way and, therefore, prevent others in adjacent buildings from doing similar. In relation to the swimming pool, the Member suggested that if one was worried about being overlooked, they may wish to choose a swimming pool not in the middle of the City of London surrounded by skyscrapers. He added that the business model of The Ned private members club having around 3,500 members indicated, in his view, that exclusive use of such a facility was not particularly high on the list of priorities and suggested officers had done a good job to weigh up the different pros and cons of the application. The Member further added that he agreed with a previous point made in relation to suicide prevention, but stated he was unsure that a drop of two storeys merited the same level of barriers and protection as would usually be warranted.

The Chair brought the debate to a close stated the Sub-Committee had heard somewhat contradictory statements on the issues of consultation and engagement and Members has raised the issue of heritage impact, and the influence it could have over the views of a Grade One-listed building nearby. He added that Members had heard that officers placed relatively low material weight on the dilemma related to views from the private members club as it was not a residential or public space and was, therefore, relatively low ranked in their deliberations. The Chair noted that the issue of suicide prevention had been raised by Members and suggested the application appeared to be compliant with the City's SPD suicide prevention and felt it was difficult to complete design away suicide in any building. The Chair also suggested the Sub-Committee potentially strayed too far into attempting to co-design the shape, look and feel of a building and stated that officers had to weigh things up against one another within the National Planning Policy Framework and the City Plan and officers were content with the application which was why they had made the recommendation to the Sub-Committee to support the application. The Chair indicated he would support the officer recommendation to grant approval of the planning application.

The Chair moved the meeting to a vote on the planning application.

The Sub Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendation before them.

Votes were cast as follows:

FOR – 12

AGAINST – 9

ABSTENTION – 1

Therefore, the recommendation was carried.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Granted Planning Permission for the above proposal (1 Old Jewry) in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule in the main report pack.

4. **55 FLEET STREET, EC4Y 1JU**

Tana Adkin KC and Josephine Hayes formally recused themselves and left the meeting as per their declarations at the beginning of the meeting on the item.

The Sub-Committee considered a report which sought a change of use at 55 Fleet Street, EC4Y 1JU from Class E offices to *sui generis* Adult Gaming Centre, across ground floor and part basement levels.

Officers introduced the application and presented the site location plan which noted that the site was on the south side of Fleet Street itself, with Pleydell Court which ran along its eastern elevation. Officers added that there were also residential properties nearby directly to the west at 53 and 54 Fleet Street and to the east at Plato House, as well as residential properties in the wider area on the north side of Fleet Street at Bolt Court and Red Line Court. The building was also located in the Fleet Street PSC. Officers informed Members that the application was for a change of use at the ground floor of 55 Fleet Street and part of its existing office use to use as an adult gaming centre, the proposed hours of use which were 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Officers stated they had consulted nearby, erected sign notices, and issued a press notice as well given its location within a Conservation Area. Officers noted they had received 24 letters of objection and a petition in objection with 186 signatories. Officers confirmed that the proposal was recommended for refusal on four grounds.

Officers presented the existing elevations to the Sub-Committee and their existing use as offices across all levels at the basement, first, second, third, and fourth floors, and there were no changes proposed externally. They also presented the existing layouts for the proposed floors subject to proposed changes and noted there was office floor space on the right-hand side on the existing ground floor and the connected basement on the left-hand side. Officers also noted there was a secondary entrance onto Pleydell Court on the eastern elevation.

Officers presented the proposed plans to Members and stated that they showed the adult gaming centre on the ground floor on the right side with two rows of gaming machines which were connected to its rear by a set of stairs to staff welfare facilities and to customer toilets on the basement level.

Officers reiterated that the application was recommended for refusal on four grounds which included the proposed loss of office floor space without requisite viability of market evidence as required by City policy and its office-use SPD which was exacerbated by the loss of such office floor space which would prejudice the use of office floor space on the floors above which was not subject to the application. The second reason was that the proposed use was not considered a retail use and would have a physically and visually impermeable and inactive frontage which would therefore cause harm to the Fleet Street PSC and was a particular concern given that Plato Court ran along the eastern elevation which was already not very well overlooked or surveyed and, therefore, would be exacerbated by the proposal. Officers continued and stated that the third reason for refusal was that the lack of active frontage and the highest risk profile of the use proposed and reduction in activity would lead

to security and safety concerns of which the application and proposal itself had not demonstrated had been designed to be a safe and secure space, or maintain and enhance the safety and security of the surrounding area. The last reason for refusal related to information missed from the proposal for Officers to make a determination or judgement on what would typically be required of such an application on the impact of noise and disturbance to nearby residents and harm to residential amenity of which there had been little information or detail provided on safety and security measures, as well as details on operational management, servicing and waste.

The Chair informed the Sub-Committee that no Objector or Applicant had registered to speak, but a Member who was not a Member of the Sub-Committee had applied to speak for up to 5 minutes as per the Planning Protocol.

The Chair invited Alderwoman Martha Grekos to address the Sub-Committee meeting.

Alderwoman Grekos of Castle Baynard ward informed the Sub-Committee that she endorsed the recommendation for refusal by the planning officers as the application was contrary to planning policy, specifically with regard to undermining of Fleet Street as a PSC, contrary to the environmental amenity needs of the area for both workers and residents given the 24/7 operating hours which the City of London Police had also indicated they did not support, and was likely to create a heightened risk in antisocial behaviour as there was a lack of active frontage which did not comply with secured by design principles and there was no detail for staff welfare. The Alderwoman stated that the report correctly analysed the impact of the development proposals against current and emerging policies and agreed with the assessment and noted that the harm that such a development would cause to the area. The Alderwoman added that the four reasons indicated for refusal were sound and noted her ward had been undergoing significant transformational change, with Fleet Street meant to be thriving in the next few years as a legal quarter mixed with residents, banking, insurance and accounting industries with retail and hospitality to match the consumers. Alderwoman Grekos thanked fellow Castle Baynard Common Councillors who had campaigned before their election to the Court and submitted the petition of 186 signatures from constituents in the ward. Alderwoman Grekos further added that one could see Castle Baynard constituents were against the proposals and there had been no single submission in favour of approval. She further stated that the reasons stated in that letter had been picked up entirely in the assessment and indicated she was grateful to planning officers for taking them into consideration. Alderwoman Grekos urged the Sub-Committee to approve the recommendation of refusal of the change of use application.

The Chair moved the meeting to questions of the officers from the Sub-Committee.

A Member sought an explanation as to whether officers were able to raise their concerns with the applicant about the lack of information identified and how had

they responded. Officers explained that they would typically ask for small scale amendments or specific information if they thought that, overall, the application was supportable. However, in this circumstance, the principle of development was not supportable and, therefore, Officers confirmed they did not ask for all the information at the start of the process as the application was invalid. Officers further stated that they did ask for some detail and the applicant had provided information on how the basement would operate. Officers added that the stairs at the rear of the premises were not part of the application as they needed to remain shared between the proposed use and the use on the upper floors. Officers concluded in response to the question posed by the Member that as refusal was recommended, the applicant was not given the opportunity to provide all the information listed in refusal reason four.

The Chair moved the meeting of the Sub-Committee to a debate on the application.

A Member stated he was surprised at the lack of information provided and was conscious that most adult gaming centres sought to locate themselves in city centres and town centres. He added he was glad that officers had judged that the application could not be supported even if further information had been provided.

The Chair moved the meeting to a vote on the change of use application.

The Sub Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendation to refuse before them.

Votes were cast as follows:

FOR – 17

AGAINST – 0

ABSTENTION – 0

Therefore, the recommendation was carried.

RESOLVED- That, Members:

- Authorised the Development Director to issue a decision notice refusing Planning Permission for the above proposal for the following reasons:
 1. The proposal fails to justify the acceptability of the loss of office floorspace, including a lack of justification for the impact of the proposal on the office floorspace within the remainder of the building above ground floor level, and with no demonstration that the proposal meets the wider objectives of the Local Plan. The proposal would therefore be contrary to London Plan Policy E1 (Offices), Local Plan Policies CS1 (Offices) and DM1.1 (Protection of Office Accommodation), draft City Plan 2040 Policies S4 (Offices) and OF2 (Protection of Existing Office Floorspace), and the City of London Office Use SPD.

2. The proposals would fail to maintain or enhance the vitality or viability of the area as a Primary Shopping Centre, including through its failure to provide physically and visually permeable active frontages, contrary to Local Plan Policies CS20 (Retailing), DM10.1 (New Development) and DM20.1 (Principal Shopping Centres), and draft City Plan Policies S5 (Retail and Active Frontages) and OF2 (Protection of Existing Office Floorspace).
3. By reason of the shared access to the rear of the building and the resulting harm to the security of the building, the failure of the proposal to provide active frontages and the proposed operation being undertaken twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, the proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would be adequately designed to ensure the safe and secure operation of the premises, or maintain the safety and security of the spaces around the building, contrary to Local Plan Policies CS3 (Security and Safety) and DM3.2 (Security Measures in New Development and Around Existing Buildings), and draft City Plan Policies S2 (Safe and Secure City), SA3 (Designing in Security) and S8 (Design).
4. By reason of a lack of information submitted to determine their impacts, as related to operational management, safety and security, protection of residential amenity through noise and disturbance, and servicing and waste management, it has not been demonstrated that there would be an acceptable impact with regards to any such matters. Therefore, the proposal is not in accordance with London Plan Policy D13 (Agent of Change), Local Plan Policies CS3 (Security and Safety), DM21.3 (Residential Environment), and DM3.5 (Night-Time Entertainment), and draft City Plan Policies CV5 (Evening and Night-Time Economy) and SA2 (Safe and Secure City).

5. ***VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee received a report which detailed development applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the report to the last meeting.

A Member raised a question with regard to Cripplegate House on One Golden Lane where a number of planning conditions had been mentioned and sought assurance that the noise experienced from One Golden Lane was not going to be further worsened by the planning conditions applied. However, the Member indicated she had received assurance in the morning that the planning conditions would not affect noise on the site. Officers confirmed that the conditions were related to detailed design of various aspects of the scheme and were not related to construction impacts.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Note the report and its contents.

6. ***DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

The Sub-Committee received a report which detailed development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

7. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

No questions on matters related to the work of the Sub-Committee were raised at the meeting.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

The Chair informed the Sub-Committee meeting that the Planning team had won an award for innovation in placemaking for the City's thermal comfort modelling and guidelines, and had also received a commendation for the City's free-to-visit elevated public areas initiative at the Adept Awards the week before and congratulated the officers.

A Member raised concerns on letters of consultation and time taken to receive them as she had personally received a letter that had given her 28 days to comment and 14 days to reach her. The Member stated that it needed to be ensured that if second class post was going to be used, the consultation period either needed to be extended or the post hand-delivered, especially as re-consultation periods were shorter. The Chair asked officers to provide a response to the comments raised.

The Member also queried as to what applications were likely to come forward for the 17 June meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee. Officers suggested it was likely to be a case of Holborn Gate, and an associated case in St. Andrew's Place for a change of use.

The Chair formally concluded the meeting.

The meeting ended at 12:23

Chair

Contact Officer: Callum Southern
Callum.Southern@cityoflondon.gov.uk